

**JAN 28 2008**

Milliken & Company  
Legal Department (M-495)  
920 Milliken Road  
Post Office Box 1926  
Spartanburg, SC 29304

## Fax

<b>To:</b>	Commissioner for Patents Examiner: Arti Singh	<b>From:</b>	John E. Vick, Jr. Patent Counsel Registration No. 33,808
<b>Fax:</b>	571-273-8300	<b>Fax:</b>	864-503-1999
<b>Phone:</b>		<b>Phone:</b>	864-503-1383
<b>Subject:</b>	Application Serial No. 09/501,467 Docket No. 2129 Applicant: Li et al. Filed: February 9, 2000 Title: "Low permeability airbag cushions having extremely low coating levels"		
		<b>Date:</b>	January 28, 2008
<b>Copies:</b>		<b>Pages:</b>	5 (including cover)

**Comments:**

Please find attached the following:

Third Status Inquiry	- 1 page
Copy of Decision on Petition to Grant dated May 11, 2004 from the Office of Petitions	- 3 pages

**Confidentiality Notice:**

Privileged/Confidential information may be contained in this facsimile and is intended only for the use of the addressee. If you are not the addressee, or the person responsible for delivering this facsimile to the addressee, you may not copy or deliver it to anyone else. If you receive this facsimile by mistake, please notify us immediately by telephone. Thank you.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 28 2008

U. S. PTO Customer No.: 25280

Case No.: 2129

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Li et al.

Serial Number: 09/501,467

Filed: February 9, 2000

For: **LOW PERMEABILITY AIRBAG CUSHIONS HAVING EXTREMELY  
LOW COATING LEVELS**

Group Art Unit: 1771

Examiner: Arti Singh

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450


Sir:

**Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence, and all correspondence referenced herein, is being sent to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, by facsimile to 571-273-8300.

Date: January 28, 2008

Signature:




Name: Linda-Ann Manley

**THIRD STATUS INQUIRY**

Please verify the status of the above-captioned application and forward such results to the person signing below. It is believed that this application has become "lost" on the Patent Office docket, but it should be examined. A "Decision On Petition" dated May 11, 2004 is the last correspondence from the U.S. PTO we have received and the RCE should be processed. Please inform us of the status as soon as possible.

Respectfully requested,

John E. Vick, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration Number 33,808Milliken & Company, M-495  
920 Milliken Road  
P.O. Box 1926  
Spartanburg, SC 29304  
Telephone: (864) 503-1383  
Facsimile: (864) 503-1999

JAN 28 2008



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1480  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1480  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No. 15

MAY 13 2004

SMC  
Milliken & Company  
920 Milliken Road  
P. O. Box 1926  
Spartanburg, SC 29304

COPY MAILED

MAY 11 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

ON PETITION

In re Application of  
Shulong Li, et al.  
Application No. 09/501,467  
Filed: February 9, 2000  
Attorney Docket No. 2129

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed November 24, 2003, to revive the above-identified application.

→ The petition is **GRANTED**.

A final Office action was mailed to applicant on April 22, 2003, setting a three-month shortened statutory period within which to submit a reply. In the instant petition, applicant argues that an amendment was, in fact, timely filed on June 3, 2003. Applicant provided a copy of the post card receipt establishing receipt of the amendment dated June 3, 2003. While the amendment was submitted to the Office timely, it was reviewed by the examiner and determined that it did not place the application in condition for allowance. A copy of the Advisory Action by the examiner is enclosed herewith.

In view of the above, the application was properly held abandoned and petitioner is not entitled to a refund of the petition fee.

→ Nevertheless, petitioner has filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and submission required by 37 CFR 1.114, with the petition.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (703) 306-3475.

↘ The application file is being forwarded to Technology Center 1700 for processing the RCE.

*Marianne E. Morgan*  
Marianne E. Morgan  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

Enclosure: Advisory Action

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/501,467

Applicant(s)

LI ET AL.

Examiner

Ms. Arti Singh

Art Unit

1771

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 28 2008

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 11/24/03 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** (check either a) or b))

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-39.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Ms. Arti Singh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1771

Application No. 09/501,467

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: firstly, they rely on unentered amendments, and secondly, the amended limitation that Applicant now desires, which now puts a lower limit on the amount of coating sheds a different light on the article and thus raise issues that require further search and consideration. Additionally, Applicant is made aware that optimizing the coating weight would be well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art, and that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art, as the range used by cited patent in the rejection, and to what Applicant is now claiming varies only minimally.